

Remarks

The following numbered paragraphs are provided to respond to the similarly numbered paragraphs in the Office Action (e.g., paragraph "2" below corresponds to paragraph 2 in the Office Action).

2. The Office Action objected to the drawings. Applicant has amended Fig. 7 to include "Yes" and "No" labels. A copy of the amended Fig. 7 including the changes circled in red is provided along with a clean copy of the amended Fig. 7.

3. With respect to claim 9 and the "system" limitation, Applicant points out that the preamble to the claim includes a medical imaging system and therefore Applicant believes there is antecedent basis for the system limitation.

4-16. The Office Action rejected each of claims 1-21 of the present application as obvious over the Microsoft reference and Watts. Applicant has amended each of claims 1, 10 and 21 so that each of those independent claims now requires, among other things, identifying non-preferred applications and disabling those non-preferred applications (i.e., the limitations of original claims 2, 11 and 21 have been rolled into claims 1, 10 and 20, respectively). Claim 18 includes disabling limitations similar to claims 1, 10 and 20.

The present invention was provided for two primary purposes. First, the present invention was provided to streamline the process of booting medical imaging system applications that are preferred by particular users. To this end, the background section of the present application teaches that in the medical imaging field, there are many (e.g., hundreds) different software applications that may or may not be required to perform certain imaging activities. The prior way of ensuring that applications were booted up as quickly as needed was to simply maintain all of the programs booted so that as different users used the system, whatever programs were preferred by the user would be ready for use.

Second, the present invention is provided to automatically configure an imaging system so that preferred applications are performed as quickly as possible.

To this end, as indicated in the background section of the present application, because all of the applications were previously booted up and ready to go in the prior art, the preferred applications were performed relatively slowly. Consistent with claims 1, 10, 18 and 20, the solution provided by the present invention is to turn off or disable non-preferred applications thereby providing more computing power to perform required applications.

The Office Action recognizes that the Microsoft reference fails to teach or suggest identifying preferred applications that are already booted and booting up the ones that are not already booted. Similarly, the Microsoft reference fails to teach or suggest identifying booted applications that are not preferred and disabling those non-preferred applications.

With respect to Watts, the Office Action assumes that disabling non-preferred applications can be inferred from enabling preferred applications - Applicant strongly disagrees. To this end, first, Watts clearly does not teach disabling applications that are non-preferred by a user. Applicant scoured Watts and was unable to find any user related disabling function.

Second, as in the case of the prior art systems described in the background section of the present application, Watts' auto-launch feature (see col. 12 generally) is primarily concerned with speeding up the process of booting or launching applications for a particular user. To speed up set up of a customized desktop (i.e., to speed up application launch), Watts teaches that a user's preferred applications are automatically launched and that, if some preferred applications are already running, those applications that are already running are not re-launched (see col. 12, lines 49-57).

Watts also teaches that a computer's environment and hence the preferred applications may change routinely. Here, where environmental change is routine and the primary function is to have programs up and running as quickly as possible, disabling or turning off programs that have already been booted simply slows down the desktop customization process – which is not consistent with the primary function (i.e., this is inconsistent with the function of speeding up preferred program booting and customization).

Third, as anyone knows that has attempted to turn off a personal computer when several applications are booted, the application turn off or disabling process

can be time consuming and therefore burdensome. Once again, in the case of Watts where the primary purpose of the concept is to speed up desktop customization, disabling non-preferred applications is inconsistent.

Fourth, with respect to the language in claim 6 of Watts regarding an optimal configuration, in the context of a computer that has different preferred application sets in different environments where the environments change routinely, the optimal configuration would be one wherein most if not all of the applications are already booted and the desktop is configured quickly to reflect a preferred sub-set of the applications within a specific environment. In this case, as the environment changes and the preferred sub-set changes, the desktop could be altered most quickly. Thus, optimal configuration in the context of Watts includes one wherein the desktop reflects a user's preferred applications but wherein most or all of the applications are booted so that if the environment is altered, the desktop can be expeditiously modified to reflect the environmental change. This reading of the claim 6 language is completely consistent with Watts' teachings.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant believes each of claims 1, 10, 18 and 20 and claims dependent therefrom are patently distinct over the cited references and allowance of the same is requested.

With respect to claim 8, claim 8 requires, among other things, for each preferred application specified by a user, automatically identifying critical applications that are critical or necessary to operation of the associated preferred application and adding the critical applications to the preferred applications of the user. Despite statements to the contrary in the Office Action, Watts fails to teach or suggest automatically identifying critical applications and adding the critical applications to a list of preferred applications. In fact, in the context of the paragraph (col. 12, lines 18-32) cited in the Office Action as suggesting this limitation, Watts teaches away from adding *.dll files to a list of preferred applications for automatic booting purposes. To this end, lines 18-32 teach a system wherein a processor counts the number of times certain applications are employed by a user in a certain environment and periodically queries the user whether or not routinely used applications should be added to a preferred list for auto-launch purposes when the environment again occurs. Watts goes on to state that "Other executables, such as *.dll files are not counted, because they are typically launched by programs rather

than directly by users." (Emphasis added.) This is a clear teaching that *.dll files are not added to a preferred applications list.

Moreover, Applicant notes that while some executable applications may employ *.dll files periodically, *.dll files are not required each time an application is performed and therefore are not necessary or critical to associated applications. Where *.dll files are not needed, a process that automatically boots those files upon an environmental change would simply slow the desktop optimization process and again would be inconsistent with the primary function of quickly customizing desktops as a function of environment.


Each of claims 16 and 19 includes limitations similar to the claim 8 limitations described above and therefore Applicant believes that each of claims 16 and 19 is patentable over the cited references for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 8.

Applicant has introduced no new matter in making the above amendments and antecedent basis exists in the specification and claims as originally filed for each amendment. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant believes claims 1, 3-10 and 12-20 of the present application recite patentable subject matter and allowance of the same is requested. No fee in addition to the fees already authorized in this and accompanying documentation is believed to be required to enter this amendment, however, if an additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 07-0845 in the amount of the fee.

Respectfully submitted,

PHANI KUMAR BIDARAHALLI

Date: 7-20-04

By: 
Michael A. Jaskolski
Reg. No. 37,551
Attorney for Applicant
QUARLES & BRADY, LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI. 53202-4497
(414) 277-5711



Red indicates changes

Fig. 7

